REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant hereby responds to the Office Action mailed April 6, 2006.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 – 5, 7 – 10, 12 – 14, and 16, taking the position that the claims were unpatentable over Friedman (US 2002/0029404) in view of Park (US 6,446,266) and Goldsmith (US D93,212): Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection and submits that the cited references were not considered as a whole and do not contain any suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves, in the nature of the problem to be solved, or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine the reference teachings to result in the claimed invention, particularly as amended by this Response. Even so, in response to the Office Action Applicant hereby amends claims 1, 8, and 13 to further clarify the claimed invention. Each of those claims is amended to specify that the elastomeric section permits the cap to snuggly engage a wearer's head and that the first ribbon and the second ribbon permit the wearer to decorate or gather the wearer's hair.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner appears to have utilized the claimed invention's simplicity to arrive at the §103(a) rejection of the claims. However, "[i]n making the assessment of differences, section 103 specifically requires consideration of the claimed invention 'as a whole.' Inventions typically are new combinations of existing principles or features. The 'as a whole' instruction in title 35 prevents evaluation of the invention part by part." Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co., 357 F.3d

Application No. 10/723,550

Amendment dated June 14, 2006

Reply to Office Action of April 6, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 03-12538

1270, 1275 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (citations omitted). Thus, the "as a whole" requirement

prevents "using the invention as a roadmap to find its prior art components." Id.

In the Office Action, the Examiner pointed to individual features of the claimed

invention in the prior art. The Examiner did not show, however, that the combination

of the disclosures, taken as a whole, suggests the claimed invention. Even if the

general concepts of a sweatband having an elastomeric section and a first and second

ribbon are known, the claimed combination of a cap having a body, a sweatband, a

visor, and a first and second ribbon, as described in each independent claim,

particularly as amended, is not known, motivated, or suggested until the present

invention. For example, the Examiner has not shown that a person of ordinary skill in

the art would have thought to combine a sweatband including an elastomeric section and

a first and second ribbon. As described in the Specification, this combination provides

the advantage, among others, of enabling the wearer to tie the wearer's hair for

decorative purposes, gather the wearer's hair, and provide additional securement of the

cap on the wearer's head. The references cited by the Examiner, however, use either

an elastic band or a ribbon/cord, and they use it to fasten the cap to the wearer's head.

There is no suggestion that both a sweatband having an elastomeric section and a first

and second ribbon could be included to permit the wearer to decorate or gather the

wearer's hair, as well as secure the hat to the user.

The Applicant, therefore, submits that the Office Action did not show any

genuine teaching, motivation, or suggestion to combine the cited references. As such,

7

Application No. 10/723,550

Amendment dated June 14, 2006

Reply to Office Action of April 6, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 03-12538

the Applicant respectfully submits that the Applicant's teachings themselves have been

used to piece together the cited references through hindsight reconstruction. Since this

combination of a sweathand having an elastomeric section and a first and second ribbon

is present in each of the independent claims 1, 8, and 13, particularly as amended, the

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1 - 5, 7 - 10, 12 - 14, and

16 be withdrawn and that the claims be passed to allowance.

The Examiner also rejected claims 6, 11, and 13 as being unpatentable over

Friedman, Park, and Goldsmith, and in further view of Beckerman (US 5,615,415).

As noted above, since each of the independent claims 1, 8, and 13, particularly as

amended, contain the combination of a sweatband including an elastomeric section and

a first and second ribbon, the Applicant submits that the Office Action did not show any

genuine teaching, motivation, or suggestion to combine the cited references to produce

the claimed combination. As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection

of claims 6, 11, and 13 be withdrawn and that the claims be passed to allowance

Claims 1 - 16 remain in this application. No new matter has been added to this

application by this response to the Office Action.

///

///

///

8

Application No. 10/723,550 Amendment dated June 14, 2006

Reply to Office Action of April 6, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 03-12538

Having responded to each of the Examiner's concerns, Applicant asserts that the

application is now in condition for allowance and solicits that action. If a telephone

interview will advance the allowance of the application, enable an Examiner's

amendment, or promote other meaningful discussion of the case, Applicant requests the

Examiner contact Applicant's representative at the number listed below.

It is not believed that any additional fees are due; however, in the event any

additional fees are due, the Examiner is authorized to charge Applicant's attorney's

deposit account no. 03-2030.

Respectfully submitted,

CISLO & THOMAS LLP

Dated: June 2006

Reg. No. 32,973

DMC/SDO

CISLO & THOMAS LLP 233 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 900 Santa Monica, California 90401

Tel: (310) 451-0647 Fax: (310) 394-4477 www.cislo.com

T:\03-12538\RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION MAILED APRIL 6 2006.DOC

Application No. 10/723,550 Amendment dated June 14, 2006 Reply to Office Action of April 6, 2006



Attorney Docket No. 03-12538

CERTIFICATE OF FIRST CLASS MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an enveloped addressed as follows:

Mail Stop AMENDMENT Commissioner for Patents Post Office Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Dated: June 14, 2006

Daniel M. Cislo, Reg. No. 32,973